

Serial No. **09/923,359**

Docket No. **K-0311**

Amendment dated December 29, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 2, 2006

REMARKS

Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter); (3) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; and/or (4) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

By the present response, Applicants have submitted new claim 36 for consideration by the Examiner and respectfully submit that this claim does not contain any prohibited new matter. Further, Applicants have amended claims 5, 7, 8, 18, 30, 32 and 35 to further clarify the invention. Claims 5-9, 18 and 30-36 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has maintained the previous objection to claims 7 and 8 and has maintained the previous 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 35. Claims 5-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,504,482 (Schreder). Claims 18 and 30-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,959,577 (Fan et al.).

Claim Objections

The Examiner has maintained the objection to claims 7 and 8 asserting that claim 6 (from which they depend) does not require the current traffic conditions and information of each road in the region is collected. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7 and 8 as amended in Applicants' previously filed response overcame these rejections. However, in the interest of furthering prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended these claims to further clarify the invention. In this regard, claims 7 and 8 further limit claim 6 by stating that "the special information comprises the information of the current traffic conditions in the region" as well as providing further details on these traffic conditions, and "the special information comprises the information of each road in the region" along with further details regarding the road conditions. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 6 has been further limited by dependent claims 7 and 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

The Examiner maintains that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph rejection of claim 35 asserting that no method for sending, receiving, or checking an email account has been disclosed in claim 32. However, Applicants fail to understand this reasoning since although this is not disclosed in claim 32, it is disclosed in claim 35, thereby further limiting the service set that is disclosed in claim 32. However, to further prosecution of the present application, Applicants

have amended this claim to further clarify the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 5-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schreder. Applicants have discussed the deficiencies of this reference in Applicants' previously filed response and reassert all arguments submitted in that response. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and provide the following additional remarks.

Regarding claim 5, Applicants submit that Schreder does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of this claim. For example, Schreder does not disclose or suggest connecting to the Internet by a client using a mobile phone of the client, the connection being to a server network on the Internet, the client requesting special information. Schreder merely discloses an automobile having a GPS satellite navigation unit and a local area digitized street map system for electronic positioning and route guidance between departures and arrivals, and that emergency care providers are automatically notified of the location of the automobile using telecommunications. Schreder does not disclose or suggest connecting to the Internet using a mobile phone of a client where the connection is to a sever network on the Internet. These limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested by Schreder.

Regarding claims 6-9, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 5 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Schreder does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 5-9 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 18 and 30-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fan et al. Applicants have discussed the deficiencies of this reference in Applicants' previously filed response and reassert all arguments submitted in that response. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and provide the following additional remarks.

Regarding claims 18, 30 and 32, Applicants submit that Fan et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims. For example, Applicants submit that Fan et al. does not disclose or suggest connecting to the Internet by an owner using a mobile phone of the owner, the connection being to a server network on the Internet. The Examiner appears to assert that Fan et al. discloses a request being through an Internet connection, at col. 9, line 49- col. 10 line 21. However, these portions of Fan merely disclose that the mobile unit has three functional sections, a GPS receiving section, a control section and a communication section where the mobile unit communicates with GPS satellites, allows commands and requests to be entered by the control section (i.e., microprocessor) and includes a

wireless modem circuit for communication to a data network over a wireless telephone network interface. This is not connecting to the Internet using a mobile phone, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions merely relate to GPS satellite communication and wireless phone communication over telecommunication network. Fan et al. does not disclose or suggest connecting to the Internet using a mobile phone or the connection being to a server network on the Internet, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, Fan et al. does not disclose or suggest transmitting the data of the requested information over the Internet to an IP of the mobile phone.

Regarding claims 31 and 33-35, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 30 and 32 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Fan et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 18 and 30-35 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

New Claim

Applicants submit that new claim 36 is patentable over the cited references at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding the other independent claims.

Serial No. **09/923,359**

Docket No. **K-0311**

Amendment dated December 29, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 2, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 5-9, 18 and 30-36 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



John C. Eisenhart
Registration No. 38,128
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 JCE/FDB:tlg

Date: December 29, 2006

\\Fk4\Documents\2016\2016-054\110505.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610